

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/840,145	Applicant(s) LASEE, JACK C.	
	Examiner William V. Gilbert	Art Unit 3635	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William V. Gilbert. (3) K. Baxter.

(2) B Katcheves. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 13 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stark (U.S. Patent No. 4,259,818), LaSee (U.S. Patent No. 5,207,044).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussion to claim around the prior art of record. In particular the structural relation between the window and the frame containing it. It was noted that the phrases in the claims relating to the operation of the invention (i.e. when the window is in the molten state) is functional.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/William V Gilbert/ Examiner, Art Unit 3635	
--	--